Jesus' Exposition of Scripture in Luke 20:9-19: An Inquiry in Light of Jewish Hermeneutics

CHARLES A. KIMBALL III
HOWARD PAYNE UNIVERSITY
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS

The exposition of the OT formed the basis of Jesus' teachings and of many of his debates with his religious opponents. His exposition of Isaiah 5 in Luke 20:9-19, more commonly known as the Parable of the Wicked Tenants, is one of eight pericopes in Luke in which Jesus expounds explicit OT quotations.[1] In this exposition Jesus explicitly pronounced a judgment on his religious opponents and implicitly gave a christological lesson.

In this essay, the Lukan form of the expository Parable of the Wicked Tenants will be analyzed in light of the exegetical methods of first-century Judaism by examining (1) the pertinent introductory problems, (2) the text-form of the OT citation, (3) the passage exegetically, and (4) the literary form of the exposition.[2]

INTRODUCTION

Jesus' exposition of Isaiah 5 appears in all three Synoptic Gospels (Matt 21:33-46; Mark 12:1-12; Luke 20:9-19)[3] and in the Gospel of

---

A revision of a paper presented to the 1991 southwest regional meeting of the Institute for Biblical Research in Dallas, Texas, on 16 March 1991.

1. These expositions appear in 4:1-13; 4:16-30; 10:25-37; 18:18-30; 20:9-19; 20:27-40; 20:41-44; 21:25-28 and are analyzed in my doctoral dissertation (C. A. Kimball, "Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel" [Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1991]).

2. We will use the methodology of the following studies: J. W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954); R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975); E. E. Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1990); and idem, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1978).

3. Because of the present state of the Synoptic problem, this analysis is made without a commitment to any particular source theory. For a similar stance see C. H.

Thomas 65-66.[4] Apart from Luke 20:18 (=. Matt 21:44), Luke's version is more abbreviated than its Synoptic parallels, and Matthew's is the fullest of the three. Luke's parable shares several details with Matthew's that are absent in Mark (e.g., the expulsion of the son before his death [15], the listeners' response to Jesus' question [16], and the second stone saying [18]), which suggests that they used a Q tradition in addition to the common triple tradition.[5]

      Because this parable is undeniably an allegory in its synoptic form and because it contains an OT quotation and several allusions, scholars debate its original form and its authenticity.

      A. Jülicher in reaction to the arbitrary and elaborate allegorical interpretations of the patristic and medieval commentators argued Jesus' parables were simple comparisons that made one point and that did not require interpretation. By his a priori definition he claimed that Jesus' parables were not allegorical, and he attributed any allegorical traits to the evangelists' creation. (1) Because of the alleged psychological impossibilities in the actions of the characters and (2) because of the allegorical features in the Parable of the Wicked Tenants, he concluded that it was an allegory of the history of salvation which was created by the early church.[6]

Talbert, *Reading Luke* (New York: Crossroad, 1982) 1-2; and L. Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 1992) x—xi, 15-17. For a recent evaluation of the Synoptic problem see, e.g., R. H. Stein, *The Synoptic Problem* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987); D. Wenham, "Source Criticism," *New Testament Interpretation* (ed. I. H. Marshall; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977) 139-52; and E. E. Ellis, "Gospels Criticism," *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien* (ed. P. Stuhlmacher; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1983) 34-38, who writes, "In the present state of affairs source criticism appears either to have come full circle or to have reached something of an impasse."

      4. For a detailed comparison and tradition history of the accounts without a priority assumption see K. Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1983) 41-71. For a brief redactional analysis of Luke's version based on Markan priority see J. A. Fitzmyer, *Luke X—XXIV* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1985) 1277-78.

      5. Because of the agreements between Matthew and Luke (assuming their mutual independence) against Mark, some scholars think that they used a Q tradition alone or in combination with Mark. For the use of Q alone see, e.g., Snodgrass, (*Wicked Tenants*, 56-71) who also argues that Matthew possesses the earliest version. For the use of Mark and Q see, e.g., Ellis, *Prophecy*, 251, n. 57. Cf. J. A. T. Robinson ("The Parable of the Wicked Tenants," *NTS* 21 [1975] 443-61) who alleges the use of Mark, Q, and an Ur-Gospel; and a reply by J. B. Orchard, "J. A. T. Robinson and the Synoptic Problem," *NTS* 22 (1976) 346-52. Otherwise: T. Schramm (*Markus-Stoff bei Lukas* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971] 150-67) posits that Luke used Mark, and Fitzmyer (*Luke X—XXIV*, 1277-78) argues for a combination of Mark and Lukan redaction. Cf. I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 726-27.

      6. A. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (Freiburg: Mohr-Siebeck, 1888-89) 1.65-85; 2.385-406. Similarly, e.g., R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper & Row, 1963) 177, 205; and C. E. Carlston, *The Parables of the Triple Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 40-45, 76-81, 178-90. Cf. Fitzmyer (*Luke X-XXIV*, 1281), who calls it "an allegorical presentation of Lucan salvation-history."

In contrast several scholars, most notably C. H. Dodd and J. Jeremias, who were influenced by the presuppositions of Jülicher and of classical form criticism, thought that it represents a genuine parable of Jesus that had undergone subsequent allegorization and expansion by the Gospel traditioners. In an attempt to find its original meaning, they stripped off the allegorical features and the OT elements, but they still ended up giving allegorical interpretations. Because of the abbreviated nature of the Gospel of Thomas 65-66, they held that it represented the most primitive form.[7]

W. G. Kümmel classified the parable as an allegory and opposed Dodd and Jeremias' attempts to de-allegorize it, to separate the secondary elements, and to explain its improbabilities. Although he followed Jülicher's view of the parables, he did not think it should be rejected in its allegorical form on a priori grounds. However, (1) he stressed alleged improbabilities in the actions of the characters, and (2) he rejected its authenticity because of its alleged postresurrection Christology.[8]

Recent studies have answered the above objections (1) to the parable's original allegorical nature, (2) to its use of a quotation and allusions from the OT, (3) to its realism, and (4) to its alleged post-Easter teachings.

First, numerous scholars have refuted the a priori rejection of the allegorical form of this and other Synoptic parables.[9] They argue the following: (1) The OT (e.g., 2 Sam 12:1-4) and rabbinic parables (e.g.,

---

7. C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (rev. ed.; New York: Scribner, 1961) 96-102; and J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (rev. ed.; New York: Scribner, 1963) 70-77. Cf. B. M. F. van Iersel (*'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten* [Leiden: Brill, 1964] 124-45) who attempts to reconstruct the original form by selecting the words and phrases from each of the versions that he considers original. Followed by X. Leon-Dufour, "La parabole des vignerons homicides," *ScEccl* 17 (1965) 365-96 (summarized in English in idem, "The Murderous Vineyard-Workers," TD 15 [1967] 30-36). Cf., e.g., B. Lindars (*New Testament Apologetic* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961] 173-74) who asserts that the OT elements were added for apologetic reasons.

8. W. G. Kümmel, "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mk 12,1-9)," *Aux sources de la tradition chretienné* (Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, 1950) 120-31; and idem, *Promise and Fulfilment* (Naperville: Allenson, 1957) 82-83. Cf. C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990) 700-701.

9. E.g., M. Black, "The Parables as Allegory," *BJRL* 18 (1960) 273-87; J. D. M. Derrett, "Allegory and the Wicked Vinedressers," *JTS* 25 (1974) 426-32; J. Drury, "The Sower, the Vineyard, and the Place of Allegory in the Interpretation of Mark's Parables," *JTS* 24 (1973) 367-79; R. E. Brown, "Parable and Allegory Reconsidered," *NovT* 5 (1962) 36-45; Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 12-30, and the literature cited; C. L. Blomberg (*Interpreting the Parables* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990]) 29-69, passim) argues for the allegorical nature of all of the Synoptic parables and presents a history of the debate on the possibility of Jesus' using allegory. A briefer argument for this thesis is given in idem, "Interpreting the Parables of Jesus," *CBQ* 53 (1991) 50-78.

b. Sanh. 91a) were usually allegorical in nature,[10] and these parables rather than the Greek forms used by Jülicher provide a better background for interpreting Jesus' parables.[11] In fact, there are two rabbinic versions of this parable that are allegorical (*Sipre Deut*. 312; *Tanh*. B. בשלח 7).[12] (2) Modern literary critics have recognized the allegorical nature of Jesus' parables.[13] (3) Even those, such as Dodd and Jeremias, who deny the allegorical nature of Jesus' parables and de-allegorize them, are inconsistent in their approach because they often interpret them allegorically.[14]

Second, the parables of the rabbis often were laced with OT allusions and often ended with quotations in a manner similar to the Parable of the Wicked Tenants.[15] Moreover, since this parable conforms to the rabbinic proem midrash pattern and has catchword connections which tie the OT citations to the parable, it probably reflects a unified exposition.[16]

Third, a number of authorities have shown that the parable describes a realistic situation in light of the known conditions of first-century Palestine and conclude that the parable is likely authentic.

10. They stress (1) that משל, which was almost always translated by παραβολή in the LXX, was used in the OT and the rabbis for various types of figurative speech including allegory and (2) that Jesus' use of parables should be understood against this Semitic background rather than Greek rhetoric. See also F. Hauck, "παραβολή," *TDNT*, 5.747-48.

11. On the similarities between Jesus' and the rabbis' parables see, e.g., D. Flusser, *Die rabbinischen Gleichnisse und der Gleichniserzähler Jesus* (vol. 1; Bern: Lang, 1981); popularized recently in English by his student B. H. Young, *Jesus and His Jewish Parables* (New York: Paulist, 1989). For a summary and evaluation of this topic, noting similarities and differences between NT and rabbinic parables, see, e.g., Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 21-26; and Blomberg, *Parables*, 58-69.

12. For a discussion of these texts in relation to Jesus' parable see Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 25-26.

13. E.g., J. D. Crossan, "Parable, Allegory, and Paradox," *Semiology and Parables* (ed. Daniel Patte; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1976) 247-81; and D. 0. Via, Jr., *The Parables* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), 2-25. See also the discussion and works cited by Blomberg, *Parables*, 49-58; and Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 19-20.

14. Black ("Parables as Allegory," 283) accused Dodd of trying to run with the allegorical hare and still hunt with the Jülicher hounds. Snodgrass (*Wicked Tenants*, 6-8) has similarly criticized Jeremias.

15. See, e.g., Derrett ("Allegory," 426-32) who (1) argues that *Sipre Deut*. 312 is related to the raw material that Jesus used for his parable and (2) concludes that Sipre *Deut*. 312 proves that a first-century Jewish scholar could tell an allegorical parable which was laced with OT allusions. Cf. C. H. Cave, "The Parables and the Scriptures," *NTS* 11 [1965] 379) who compares NT and rabbinic parables and finds that the substance of rabbinic parables was derived from the Scriptures.

16. Ellis (*Prophecy*, 206) states that although it is not impossible that the citations were added later to create a commentary framework, this practice is without parallel in the Synoptic tradition. Cf. ibid., 194, 252. See our analysis of the proem pattern and its catchword connections below.

J. D. M. Derrett reconstructs the events of the parable in light of rabbinic law, and M. Hengel provides additional parallels from the Zenon papyri and from the rabbinic parables. Building on their essays, K. Snodgrass refutes in detail the eight charges of a lack of realism brought by some modern critics.[17]

Fourth, Kümmel's objections to the parable's alleged early church theology have been countered: (1) If the early church created the idea of the Son's murder bringing the punishment on the Jews, it would have included the resurrection which was central to its theology rather than stopping at his death. (2) The "Son of God" as a pre-Christian Jewish messianic title is confirmed by the DSS (4QFlor 1:11; 1QSa 2:11-12).[18]

Furthermore, it is more likely that the abbreviated Gospel of Thomas version depended on the Synoptic tradition rather than that it represents the earliest form of the parable because of such factors as its late second- or third-century date, its Gnostic character, and the above discussion of the likelihood that Jesus used both allegory and OT references in his parables.[19]

On the basis of these recent studies we may approach Luke 20:9-19 as a unified allegorical parable that does not need to be stripped of

17. Derrett, *Law*, 286-312; M. Hengel, "Das Gleichnis von den Weingärtnern Mc 12:1-12 im Lichte der Zenonpapyri und der rabbinischen Gleichnisse," *ZNW* 59 (1968) 1-39; and Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 31-40. More briefly, e.g., E. Bammel, "Das Gleichnis von bösen Winzern (Mk 12,1-9) und das jüdische Erbrecht," *Revue internationale des Droites de l'Antiquité* 3 (1959) 11-17; Dodd, *Parables*, 96-102; and Jeremias, *Parables*, 74-76.

18. See, e.g., E. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (NCB, rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 232; and Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 84-86. Cf. F. C. Burkitt, "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen," *Transactions of the Third International Congress for the History of Religions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908) 2.321-28; he was the first to argue against a church creation in view of the absence of mention of the resurrection.

19. Several scholars find the Thomas version to depend on the Synoptics, esp. on Luke: e.g., Ellis, *Prophecy*, 206, 251-52; B. Dehandschutter, "La parabole des vignerons homicides (Mc., XII,1-12) et l'Évangile selon Thomas," *L'Evangile selon Marc* (ed. M. Sabbe; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988) 203-20; W. R. Schoedel, "Parables in the Gospel of Thomas," *CTM* 43 (1972) 548-60; K. R. Snodgrass, "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen," *NTS* 20 (1974) 142-44; idem, *Wicked Tenants*, 52-54; C. L. Blomberg, "Tradition and Redaction in the Parables of the Gospel of Thomas," *Gospel Perspectives* (ed. D. Wenham; Sheffield: JSOT, 1984) 5.177-206, and the works cited. On other texts see, e g., H. Schürmann, "Das Thomasevangelium und das lukanische Sondergut," *BZ* 7 (1963) 236-60; C. Tuckett, "Thomas and the Synoptics," *NovT* 30 (1988) 132-57, and the works cited. Otherwise: e.g., Schramm, *Markus-Stoff,* 165-67; Jeremias, *Parables*, 70-77; Dodd, *Parables*, 96-102; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1279-81; J. D. Crossan, "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen," *JBL* 90 (1971) 451-65; A. B. J. Higgins, "Non-Gnostic Sayings in the Gospel of Thomas," *NovT* 4 (1960) 299-300; and H. Montefiore, "A Comparison of the Gospel according to Thomas and of the Synoptic Gospels," *NTS* 7 (1961) 236-38.

its allegorical elements and OT references and that could have been spoken by Jesus with these features.[20] Yet this parable is certainly not an exact transcript of Jesus' words (as he did not preach thirty second sermons), but it is a piece that has been highly summarized and stylized for its transmission and incorporation into the Gospels (i.e., it represents the *ipsissima vox* of Jesus rather than the *ipsissima verba*).

THE TEXT-FORM OF LUKE 20:17

In this exposition there is one explicit quotation (Ps 118:22) and several allusions to the OT (Isa 5:1-2; 8:14-15; Dan 2:34-35, 44-45). The citation may be analyzed as follows:[21]

Luke 20:17 ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς εἶπεν· τί οὖν ἐστιν τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο· λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κε—φαλὴν γωνίας

LXX Ps 117:22 λίθον, ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας·

MT Ps 118:22 אבן מאסו הבונים היתה לראש פנה:

　　　Luke 20:17 and its parallels (Matt 21:42/Mark 12:10-11) have an exact correspondence with the LXX Ps 117:22, which is an accurate rendering of the MT Ps 118:22. The Gospels agree with each other except that Luke stops at v. 22 while Matthew and Mark include v. 23. Matthew and Mark also agree against Luke in their similar introductory formulas.[22]

　　　20. For a persuasive defense of its authenticity see esp. Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 106-10, and the works there cited. He states, "if one rejects the dominical origin of this parable, he or she does so because of presuppositions about the nature of the gospels . . . and not because of any element in the parable itself" (107-8). On the historical concerns and careful transmission of the Jesus tradition see R. Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer* (3d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1988); B. Gerhardsson, *The Origins of the Gospel Traditions* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); idem, *The Gospel Tradition* (Lund: Gleerup, 1986); H. Riesenfeld, *The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings* (London: Mowbray, 1957); Ellis, "New Directions in Form Criticism," *Prophecy and Hermeneutic*, 237-53; H. Schurmann, "Die vorösterlichen Anfänge der Logientradition," *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968) 39-65.
　　　21. For studies on the issue of the text-form of OT quotations in the NT see, e.g., B. F. C. Atkinson, "The Textual Background of the Use of the Old Testament by the New," *Journal of the Transactions of The Victorian Institute* 79 (1947) 37-70; M. Silva, 'The New Testament Use of the Old Testament," *Scripture and Truth* (eds. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983) 147-65; M. Wilcox, "Text Form," *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (Festschrift for Barnabas Lindars; (eds. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 988) 193-204, and the literature cited. For discussions on the text-form of Lukan citaions see T. Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die Zitate bei Lukas* (Berlin: Akademie, 1968); Ringgren, "Luke's Use of the Old Testament," *HTR* 79 (1986) 227-35; and C. K. arrett, "Luke/Acts," *It is Written*, 231-44.
　　　22. Matt 20:42: οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς; Mark 12:10: οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε; Luke 20:17: τί οὖν ἐστιν τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο.

   The LXX-form of OT citations and allusions attributed to Jesus cannot be used as an argument for the secondary nature of a citation because the LXX-form may be accounted for by (1) an assimilation to the LXX in the traditioning process, (2) a quotation of a Semitic original underlying the LXX, or (3) an original quotation in Greek.[23]

   In the NT Ps 118:22 also appears in Acts 4:11, where it is given a *pesher* rendering by Peter, and 1 Pet 2:7, where it is cited in agreement with the LXX in a catena of texts on Christ the living Stone (Isa 28:16; 8:14; Ps 118:22).[24]

AN EXEGESIS OF LUKE 20:9-19

The exposition of Isaiah 5 is one of Jesus' teachings in the temple that has been grouped into a unit (19:45-21:38).[25] It is preceded by his cleansing of the temple and the reaction to it (19:45-48) and a challenge to his authority by the temple leaders (20:1-9), and it is followed by further debates with the religious authorities at the temple (20:20-47),[26] a lesson on temple offerings (21:1-4), and a prediction of the temple's destruction (21:5-38). This expository parable tells the story of the leasing of a vineyard to tenants (9), who later reject the owner's servants (10-12) and his son (13-15a) and who are subsequently judged for their sinful actions (15b-18). The parable is followed by an explanation of the hostile reaction of the temple authorities who plan to harm Jesus because they realize that the parable was spoken against them (19).

---

   23. On these three points see respectively R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale, 1971) 25-26; D. J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983) 44-48; and Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 63-66. *Pace*, e.g., Jeremias, *Parables*, 70-77.

   24. For an analysis of the text-form of the NT appearances of Ps 118:22-23 see Holtz (*Zitate bei Lukas*, 160-63) who looks at Luke-Acts; and K. Stendahl (*The School of St. Matthew* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968] 67-69) who deals with the Gospels and 1 Pet 2:6-8. Cf. Ellis (*Prophecy*, 205-8) who discusses the midrashic features of Acts 4:11 and argues this testimony had its origin in a Christian midrash although not from the midrash of Luke 20:9-18.

   25. On the time frame and the grouping of these episodes see, e.g., T. W. Manson, ("The Cleansing of the Temple," *BJRL*, 33 [1950-51] 271-82) who argues that Jesus' last days in Jerusalem have been "telescoped" and that the period beginning with the cleansing of the temple lasted about six months. D. Daube ("The Earliest Structure of the Gospels," *NTS* 5 [1959] 174-89; and idem, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* [London: Athlone, 1956] 158-69) alleges that the structure of the temple debates is based upon a rabbinic pattern used in the Passover eve discussions. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 723. Ellis (*Luke*) 228, thinks it is probable that Jesus' Scripture discussions in the temple debates formed a thematic collection before they were incorporated into the Gospels. Cf. Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 188.

   26. Luke omits the question about the chief commandment at 20:40 recorded by Mark 12:28-34; Matt 22:34-40, probably because of the similar discussion he reported in Luke 10:25-28.

The Leasing of the Vineyard (v. 9)

Because the religious leaders[27] had rejected Jesus' person and teachings (cf. 20:1-8), he speaks a parable in judgment of them through an exposition of Isa 5:1-7,[28] which was a juridical and allegorical parable in its OT context.[29] Although he alters his version somewhat from the Isaianic parable by changing the roles of the parabolic figures, he uses it for a similar juridical function (cf. 20:15b -18).

　　In the Isaianic parable the prophet compares the unrighteous nation to a vineyard that Yahweh planted and nurtured but that yielded bad grapes rather than good ones. Because Yahweh looked for justice and righteousness but found murder and oppression, the prophet warns of Yahweh's judgment of destruction. Jesus uses an allusion to Isa 5:1-2 as the foundation to construct his parable.[30] But he shifts the focus of the parable in Isaiah 5 from God's vineyard[31] and its bad fruit, allegorically identified as unrighteous Israel and their sin, to the vineyard's tenant farmers and their evil actions, allegori-

27. While in Mark 12:1 dyrolc refers to the authorities of the preceding episode in which Jesus' authority is questioned, Luke 20:9 says it was spoken to the people, but the leaders are implicitly present (20:19). Snodgrass (*Wicked Tenants*, 45) cautions that one should not overstress the proximity of the parable with the authority question since Matthew places an additional parable between them; yet he thinks the evangelists intended it to serve as a veiled answer to the question.

28. On Jesus' exposition of Scripture in debate with his opponents see Ellis, *OT in Early Christianity*, 116-18.

29. Several recent studies classify Isa 5:1-7 as a juridical parable. See, e.g., J. T. Willis, "The Genre of Isaiah 5:1-7," *JBL* 96 (1977) 337-62; G. A. Yee, "The Form-Critical Study of Isaiah 5:1-7 as a Song and a Juridical Parable," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 30-40; G. T. Sheppard, "More on Isaiah 5:1-7 as a Juridical Parable," *CBQ* 44 (1982) 45-47; and C. A. Evans, "On the Vineyard Parables of Isaiah 5 and Mark 12," *BZ* 28 (1984) 82-86. In analyzing the exegetical history of the vineyard parable Evans argues (1) that after the Babylonian exile and during the emergence of the targumic traditions, Isa 5:1-7 came to be understood as a prediction of the temple's destruction and (2) that this explains the presence of the rejected stone saying in Mark 12:10-11 which anticipates the erection of a new temple. He thinks that the second stone saying of Luke 20:18 probably comes from the early church stone *testimonia*.

30. Although the allusion to Isa 5:1-2 is fuller in Matt 21:33 and Mark 12:1 than in Luke 20:9 (that omits the fence, winepress, and tower), it is still apparent in Luke 20:9. See, e.g., Snodgrass (*Wicked Tenants*, 47-48) who notes Luke's habit of abbreviating unessential details. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 728. Otherwise: e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1281; Jeremias, *Parables*, 70-71; and A. R. C. Leaney, *The Gospel according to Luke* (2d ed.; London: Black, 1966) 250, see no Isaiah 5 allusion in Luke.

31. Several OT texts represent the people of Israel as God's vineyard: e.g., Deut 32:32-33; Ps 80:8-13; Isa 5:1-7; 27:2-6; Jer 2:21; Ezek 15:1-6; 19:10-14; Hos 10:1; Joel 1:7. For the rabbinic literature see Str-B, 2.563-64. Cf. John 15:1-5 in allusion to Jer 2:21, which speaks of Jesus as God's vine.

cally identified as Israel's unrighteous religious authorities and their rejection of God's emissaries[32]

Like Isa 5:1-7 Jesus identifies the vineyard with Israel, the people of God,[33] and the vineyard owner with God. Besides the tenants who represent Israel's leaders (9b-16; cf. 19), he adds to the foundational Isaianic parable the figures of the servants who represent the prophets (10-12) and of the son who represents himself (13-15a).

The Rejection of the Servants (vv. 10-12)

The three servants, who were sent by the owner to collect the produce but who instead were beaten and abused by the tenants,[34] were probably understood by the original hearers to represent the prophets of old[35] since the OT frequently referred to the prophets as servants of God.[36] Although the OT often called the prophets God's servants, none of the servants mentioned can be identified with a specific prophet.

In Jesus' parable the servants (= prophets) are persecuted and killed (in Matthew and Mark) while in the OT the fate of specific prophets is rarely mentioned. In the OT only two named prophets are reported as murdered (Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada [2 Chr 24:21] and Uriah [Jer 26:20]), but unnamed prophets are recorded as killed

32. In error some argue that Jesus transferred the traditional meaning of vineyard as Israel to the tenants; thus, they identify the tenants as Israel rather than her leaders and see a picture of salvation-history (i.e., the Gentiles or the church replacing Israel). See, e.g., J. Blank, "Die Sendung des Sohnes," *Neues Testament und Kirche* (ed. J. Gnilka; Freiburg: Herder, 1974) 14; and D. L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1987) 126. Cf. A. Plummer, *The Gospel according to Luke* (ICC; 5th ed.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1922) 458. Yet others have demonstrated that Jesus does not transfer the traditional meaning of the vineyard to the tenants but intends the tenants to represent Israel's religious leaders. See, e.g., the following who specifically oppose this view: Blomberg, *Parables*, 248, n. 100; Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 7; and A. Cornette, "Notes sur la Parabole des Vignerons," *Foi et Vie* 84 (1985) 42-48. ee also p. 87 below.

33. Snodgrass (*Wicked Tenants*, 74--76) claims that the vineyard in Isaiah 5 and in Jesus' parable is not the nation Israel but the elect people of God and the privileges of this election. Cf. Matt 21:43, which equates the vineyard with the kingdom of God.

34. The three Synoptics vary in the details surrounding the servants. In distinction to Luke (1) Matthew has two groups that are sent with the second and third servant killed in the first group, and Mark has the third killed. (2) Matthew and Mark have additional servants sent after the initial three.

35. Pace, e.g., Fitzmyer (*Luke X—XXIV*, 1281), who claims it is uncertain what group if any the servants represent; and Jeremias (*Parables*, 71), who finds no allegorical meaning in them. But see, e.g., Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 78.

36. 1 Kgs 14:18; 15:29; 2 Kgs 9:7, 36; 10:10; 14:24; 17:13, 23; 21:10; 24:2; Ezra 9:11; Isa 20:3; 44:26; 50:10; Jer 7:25; 25:4; 26:5; 29:19; 35:15; 44:4; Ezek 38:17; Dan 9:6, 10; Amos 3:7; Zech 1:6.

(1 Kgs 18:13; 19:10, 14; Neh 9:26; Jer 2:30) and some as persecuted (1 Kgs 22:27; 2 Chr 16:10; 36:16; Jer 37:15). In the Apocrypha five prophets (Amos, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel) are said to have been martyred, and in the NT the killing of the prophets is a common theme (Matt 23:31; Acts 7:52; Heb 11:36-38; 1 Thess 2:15; cf. *Jub*. 1:12-13).

The Rejection of the Son (vv. 13-15a)

In the climax of the story,[37] after the rejection of the three servants, the owner's only son is killed by the tenants.[38] Although Jesus allegorically represents the son as himself, God's Son,[39] he does so in a veiled manner, which was characteristic of his public presentations of his messiahship and which may not have been immediately perceived by his hearers.[40] As E. E. Ellis states, "While Jesus veils the reference to himself, for the perceptive hearer he makes via the parable both a messianic claim and a prediction of his violent death."[41]

The Judgment of the Tenants (vv. 1b-18)

In ending the parable, Jesus asks a rhetorical question (15b), gives a judgment pronouncement (16), and illustrates his rejection and the leaders' judgment through a series of OT "stone" texts (17-18).

37. Luke uses a three plus one formula (prophets + Jesus), a common literary device in which the fourth part formed a dramatic climax. See, e.g., Ellis, *Luke*, 232.

38. While in Mark the son is killed then thrown out, in Matthew and Luke he is thrown out then killed. Most scholars (e.g., Ellis, *Luke*, 232; Fitzmyer, *Luke X—XXIV*, 1285; and Jeremias, *Parables*, 73) think that Matthew and Luke changed the order to accommodate the events of Jesus' death outside of Jerusalem, but others (e.g., Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 60-61; and Marshall, *Luke*, 731) argue that this is unconvincing, especially since the vineyard does not stand for Jerusalem.

39. *Pace*, e.g., A. Milavec ("The Identity of 'the Son' and 'the Others,'" *BTB* 20 [1990] 30-37; and idem, "Mark's Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen as Reaffirming God's Predilection for Israel," *JETS* 26 [1989] 289-312) who thinks the son does not represent Jesus but is only part of the machinery of the story. A. Gray ("The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen," *Hibbert Journal* [1920-21] 42-52) and M. Lowe ("From the Parable of the Vineyard to a Pre-Synoptic Source," *NTS* 28 [1982] 257-63) contend that the killing of the son in the parable refers to the death of John the Baptist. Cf. J. C. O'Neill ("The Source of the Parables of the Bridegroom and the Wicked Husbandmen," *JTS* 39 [1988] 485-89), who claims John the Baptist spoke this parable about Jesus. For a reply to Gray and Lowe see Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 81-82; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1278.

40. In the rabbinic forms of this parable (*Sipre Deut*. 312; *Tanh*. B. בשלח 7) the son is Jacob and the nation is Israel; thus, in the rabbinic parable the son has no messianic connotations. But the son of God was used of the Messiah in pre-Christian Judaism at Qumran (4QFlor 1:11; 1QSa 2:11-12). Cf. Flusser (*Gleichnisse*, 75), who thinks the hearers saw Jesus as the Son.

41. Ellis, *OT in Early Christianity*, 135; cf. idem., *Luke*, 232-33.

That the religious authorities are represented by the tenants is obvious when the parable is read with a knowledge of Jesus' conflicts with them and with the explanation of 20:19. Yet the leaders would not have realized this at the time of Jesus' rhetorical question about what the owner should do to the tenants (15b). They would have passed judgment at this time (cf. Matt 21:41) without knowing that they had condemned themselves since the parable draws them in and requires that a judgment be made by its description of the persecution and killing of God's servants. They may have thought that the tenants referred to a foreign power who occupied Israel, such as the Romans, and they would have been quite shocked when they discovered at the end of the parable that it was spoken against them (17-19).[42]

In the judgment pronouncement (16) Jesus predicts that his Father will destroy the Jewish authorities, who have been entrusted with the spiritual leadership of God's people, and replace them with others. Yet again he makes the references to himself, to the leaders, and to the time of their judgment in a veiled manner. Because of the imprecise nature of the details, the transfer of the vineyard and the time of the judgment are difficult interpretive issues. (1) The transfer of the vineyard is a transfer of the care of God's people from the Jewish churchmen to Jesus and his apostles[43] not a transfer of God's election from Israel to the church.[44] The parable is a judgment of the leaders not Israel, and it indicates that the vineyard is taken from the leaders not the nation. Thus, it foretells a transfer in the leadership of God's people not a transfer in the identity of them. If one assumes a rejection of Israel as a whole, the parable has to be seen as inconsistent in its allegorical figures (i.e., the tenants sometimes represent the *leaders* and sometimes Israel or Israel is sometimes represented by the vineyard and sometimes by the tenants). This is impossible (a) since the vineyard rather than the tenants stands for God's people (Israel), and (b) since the leaders rather than the people knew the parable was spoken against them. (2) In light of the eschatological

---

42. See Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 77-78. Otherwise: J. E. Newell and R. R. Newell ("The Parable of the Wicked Tenants," *NovT* 14 [1972] 226-37) propose that Jesus told the parable against the Zealots.

43. E.g., Ellis (*OT in Early Christianity*, 135) says Jesus will replace the tenants. Talbert (*Reading Luke*, 189) thinks that the apostles are in mind. Similarly, N. Geldenhuys (*Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951] 498) says they are the apostles and the church's later spiritual leaders.

44. Similarly, Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 90-95; and Blomberg, *Parables*, 248-49. Cf. Young (*Jewish Parables*, 282-317) who posits that it was spoken against the temple authorities because they received their positions and support through collaboration with Rome. Otherwise: e.g., Fitzmyer (*Luke X-XXIV*, 1281) sees "the others" as believers in general. Evans (*Luke*, 698) is unsure if the new tenants are the church or her leaders. Marshall (*Luke*, 731) thinks that the early church may have seen a reference to the Gentiles entering the church (cf. Matt 21:43). See also p. 85 above.

tone of the narrative and of thet OT citations in 20:17-18, the time of
the judgment seems to refer to the parousia but possibly to the de-
struction of Jerusalem or to both.[45]

In finishing his exposition of Isaiah 5,[46] Jesus speaks of himself
as a rejected (20:17) but judging stone (20:18)[47] by joining together
the rejected stone of Ps 118:22, the stumbling stone of Isa 8:14-15,
and the crushing stone of Dan 2:34-35, 44-45,[48] all of which were
given an eschatological and messianic interpretation in Judaism.[49]
He uses several Jewish exegetical techniques in his citation of these
texts. (1) He ties the three "stone" texts together by *gezerah shawah*
based on the common catchword λίθος/אֶבֶן (stone)[50] and (2) links

---

45. Most favor the parousia: e.g., Ellis (*OT in Early Christianity*) 95; and J. Jeremias
("λίθός," *TDNT*, 4.274-76), who defended the authenticity of the OT citations in this
article although he later rejected them in Parables. A few scholars opt for Jerusalem's
destruction: e.g., G. B. Caird, *The Gospel of St. Luke* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1963) 221;
Geldenhuys, *Luke*, 499; and Evans, *Luke*, 698. Otherwise: Snodgrass (*Wicked Tenants*,
90) says, "Any attempt to see an allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem or the parou-
sia in any of the accounts is impossible." He also has a helpful discussion on these two
difficult issues (87-95).

46. Although the imagery changes from the vineyard to the building here, this
transition was present in Isa 5:7 and occurred elsewhere (e.g., 1QS 8:5, 1 Cor 3:9).

47. Whether the cornerstone is a foundation stone or a capstone is debated by
scholars. For the capstone see esp. Jeremias, "λίθός," 274-76 (stresses keystone); and
J. D. M. Derrett, "The Stone the Builders Rejected," *SE* 4 (1968) 180-86. For the foun-
dation stone see esp. Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 102-3; and R. J. McKelvey, *The New
Temple* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969) 195-204. Yet the position of the stone
does not seem to be significant for interpretation, and the images of the stones in Luke
20:17-18 appear to be mixed.

48. Although it seems clear that Luke 20:18 is composed of a fusion of allusions to
Isa 8:14-15; Dan 2:34-35, 44-45 as cited in the margin of the Nestle-Aland[26] text,
scholars disagree on which texts if any are employed. E.g., Marshall (*Luke*, 732), Fitz-
myer (*Luke X-XXIV*, 1286), France (*Jesus and OT*, 98-99), and Snodgrass (*Wicked Ten-
ants*, 68) cite both texts. Ellis (*OT in Early Christianity*, 135) and Blomberg (*Parables*, 251)
find only the Daniel 2 allusions. L. T. Johnson (*The Gospel of Luke* [Collegeville: Liturgi-
cal, 1991] 309) sees only the Isa 8:14 allusion. Others (e.g., Bock, [*Proclamation*, 127];
T. W. Manson [*The Sayings of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957) 323], and G.
Bornkamm, ["λικμάω," *TDNT*, 4.280-81]) question the presence of any OT allusions
and suggest that the proverb has a parallel in Midrash on Esth 3:6: "Should the stone
fall on the crock, woe to the crock. Should the crock fall on the stone, woe to the crock.
In either case woe to the crock."

49. On Ps 118:22; Isa 8:14-15; Dan 2:34-35 see respectively, e.g, *Tg. Ps.* 118:22;
b. Sanh. 38a; *Tanh.* 31:4. For further references and discussion see Snodgrass, *Wicked
Tenants*, 98-99. Cf. Derrett, "The Stone"; and Ellis, *OT in Early Christianity*, 135.

50. Besides Luke 20:17-18, stone texts are grouped together in Rom 9:32-33 (Isa
8:14; 28:16) and 1 Pet 2:6-8 (Isa 8:14; 28:16; Ps 118:22). It seems likely that Jesus gave
the impetus to his followers for using and grouping the "stone" texts for christologi-
cal significance. For a concise study of the stone *testimonia* in the NT (Mark 12:10-11
par, Acts 4:11; Rom 9:32-33; Eph 2:19-22; 1 Pet 2:6-8) see, e.g., F. F. Bruce, "New
Wine in Old Wine Skins: III. The Corner Stone," *ExpTim* 84 (1973) 231-35. Cf. C. H.
Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952) 35-36.

them to the original text (Isa 5:2, סקל, to clear of stones)[51] in conformity to the practice of explicit midrash patterns. And in Luke's version he introduces the citation[52] with (3) "but" (δέ), an exegetical term that may be used to correct, qualify, or emphasize a citation, and (4) a *pesher*-like formula (in a slightly altered question form),[53] a formula that sometimes was used to introduce an, explanation after cited texts or a citation explaining an event.[54]

In the citation of these texts Jesus also does a אבן/בן (son/stone) wordplay,[55] a typical wordplay in the OT and Jewish writings,[56] and by this wordplay he closely ties together the citation and parable.[57] Via the rejected and judging son/stone wordplay, he makes the

51. The keyword סקל of Isa 5:2 was likely omitted here as a result of the transmission of the tradition or the incorporation of it into the Gospels. Yet Doeve (*Jewish Hermeneutics*, 116) says it was a rabbinic method to imply the context of a citation. Similarly, Dodd (*According to the Scriptures*, 126) has stressed that in the NT verses or phrases from the OT were quoted as pointers to the whole context. Ellis (*Prophecy*, 158, n. 41) thinks סקל was probably in the original form of the midrash since the Gospel tradition tends to reduce OT references.

52. The "if" ἀνέγνωτε of Matt 21:42/Mark 12:10 contrasts to that in Luke, and it is an "if " only spoken by Jesus in the NT.

53. Although the *pesher* formula is somewhat altered, the *pesher* fulfillment motif is certainly present. See Longenecker (*Biblical Exegesis*, 70-71), who calls *pesher* exegesis a "this is that" fulfillment motif and finds it to be Jesus' most characteristic employment of Scripture.

54. For further explanation and examples of the *gezerah shawah*, explicit midrash patterns, exegetical terms, and pesher formulas see Ellis, *OT in Early Christianity*, 79-101.

55. This supposes a Hebrew/Aramaic original since this wordplay only works in Hebrew/Aramaic (yet the "stone" word links noted above also work in Greek). See, e.g., the following who recognize this wordplay: J. Lightfoot, *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica* (1859; reprinted, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979) 2.435; P. Carrington, *According to Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960) 256; A. Finkel, "The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures," *RevQ* 4 (1963) 367; M. Black, "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *NTS* 18 (1971) 11-14; Ellis, *Prophecy*, 194, n. 33; and Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 63-65, 113-18. Cf. S. Kim, "Jesus—The Son of God, the Stone, the Son of Man and the Servant," *Tradition and Interpretation* (eds. G. F. Hawthorne and 0. Betz [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987] 134-48) who alleges that a more complex use of the OT is behind Jesus' wordplay and use of stone texts than Isa 5:1-2 and suggests that Zech 3:8-9; 4:7-10; 6:12-13; 9-14 functioned as a bridge for various self-identifications of Jesus here and elsewhere. For an argument for the authenticity of the OT elements on the basis of the wordplay see Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants,* 62-65, 118; Kim, "Jesus," 135-38; and Black, "Christological Use," 13-14.

56. Exod 28:9-29; 39:6-14; Josh 4:6-21; 1 Kgs 18:31; Isa 54:11-13; Lam 4:1-2; Zech 9:16; their targums; *b. Semahoth* 47-48; J. W. 5.6.3 §272. Cf. *Exod. Rabba* 20:9; 46:2; *Lam. Rabba* 4:1; *Est. Rabba* 7:10; 1QH 6:26; 7:8; 1QS 8:5-9; 4QpIS[d]. It also is reflected in Luke 19:39-40; Matt 3:9/Luke 3:8.

57. This connection is strengthened by the equation of the tenants with the builders since "builders" was a frequent rabbinic designation for religious leaders (e.g., *b. Shab*. 114a; *b. Ber*. 64a). See, e.g., Jeremias, "λιθός," 274; Derrett, "The Stone," 184-85; and Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 96. Otherwise: e.g., Leaney (*Luke*, 251) and J. M.

following christological claims along with his warning of judgment:[58] (1) More clearly than in the parable proper, he makes an indirect yet pointed claim to be the messianic Son of God, who has been rejected by the Jewish religious leaders (Ps 118:22a). (2) He adds the exaltation theme to the rejection motif made in the parable proper (Ps 118:22b).[59] (3) And he gives a stern warning to the leaders who oppose him, the son/stone, that they will be judged by destruction at the parousia (Isa 8:14-15; Dan 2:34-35, 44-45), and (4) with this warning he joins eschatology to Christology.[60]

The Reaction of the Temple Authorities

Because the temple authorities finally realize that Jesus has spoken the parable against them, they decide to take action against Jesus, but they hesitate for the time being because of Jesus' popularity with his audience.

In considering how the Jewish temple authorities took the parable as applying to themselves, B. D. Chilton offers an insightful suggestion based on the Isaiah Targum since an allusion to Isa 5:1-7 provided the starting point for the parable, as noted above. Although the literary context of the parable in the temple controversies helps explain their reaction, Chilton contends that the interpretation found in the Targum of Isa 5:1-7 suggests that Jesus' parable would have been taken this way even apart from its literary context. He points out (1) that the Targum of Isa 5:2 refers to the sanctuary and the altar as part of God's preparation of the vineyard, giving the passage a cultic reading, and (2) that the Targum's interpretation is supported by *Sukk*. 49a. Therefore, he concludes, "the basis of the parable is a complaint about the Temple leadership, an element which the evangelists convey only by the literary context they provide, but which was immediately obvious to Jesus' first hearers, because they understood his imagery in terms of the Targumic rendering of Isaiah."[61]

Creed (*The Gospel according to St. Luke* [London: Macmillan, 1930] 246) miss the wordplay and question the connection between the parable and the citation.

58. Since Psalm 118 like other royal psalms was given messianic import by Judaism and since Isa 8:14-15 describes Yahweh, Jesus' application certainly has christological implications.

59. The rejection-exaltation theme of Ps 118:22 has a vital role in the passion predictions: Mark 8:10 pars.; 9:12 par.; 9:31 pars.; 10:33 pars. See Snodgrass, *Wicked Tenants*, 99-102.

60. Jeremias ("λιθός," 275) says, "Jesus directs it against His opponents as a word of eschatological threat and a summons to repentance." See also Ellis, *OT in Early Christianity*, 135.

61. B. D. Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1984) 111-14; followed by C. A. Evans, *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation*

A PROEM-LIKE COMMENTARY PATTERN

In its literary form the Luke 20:9-18 pericope is a proem-like midrash on Isa 5:1-2,[62] its opening text, which is expounded by a parable and concluded with additional texts (Ps 118:22; Isa 8:14-15; Dan 2:34-35, 44-45). The passage joins both the parable to the texts and the texts to each other by catchwords. It has a somewhat looser pattern than the more stylized rabbinic proem midrashim that may be due to such factors as (1) an earlier stage in the practice, (2) an adaptation of the form by Jesus, (3) different theological emphases, and (4) an abbreviation and other possible minor alterations of the commentary before its incorporation into its present context.[63] Yet Luke 20:9-18 clearly portrays a proem-like midrash that has the following form:[64]

1. 9—Initial text: Isa 5:1-2 reduced to an allusion[65]
2. 10-16—Exposition by means of a parable, verbally linked to Isa 5:1, 2 by ἀμπελῶν (9, 15a, 15b, 16)
3. 17-18—Final texts: A citation of Ps 118:22 and allusions to Isa 8:14-15; Dan 2:34-35, 44-45 verbally connected by λιθός; and linked to Isa 5:2 (9 [Isa 5:2, סקל] 17, 18)

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions may be drawn from our analysis of Jesus' exposition of Isaiah 5:

(Peabody: Hendricksen, 1992) 182-83. For a study and English translation of the Isaiah Targum see Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1987). On the relation of the NT writings and the Targums see, e.g., R. LeDeaut, *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1982). On the current state of Targum studies see, e.g., P. S. Alexander, "Jewish Aramaic Translations of the Hebrew Scriptures," *Mikra* (ed. M. J. Mulder; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 217-53.

62. This has been recognized by Ellis, *Prophecy*, 157-58, 251; idem, *OT in Early Christianity*, 98, 135; followed by Blomberg, *Parables*, 251. For a discussion of this pattern and examples from the rabbis, Philo, and the NT see Ellis, *OT in Early Christianity,* 96-100.

63. Abbreviations and minor alterations (e.g., paraphrase) are apparent in a comparison of the three Synoptic versions, if it is assumed that they used the same tradition(s). Cf. ibid., 97.

64. Additional word links are preserved in the pattern of Matt 21:33-44 that do not appear in Luke (or Mark): οἰκοδομεῖν (33, 42; cf. Mark 12:1, 10) and λίθος/λιθοβολεῖν (42, 44, cf. 35). These suggest that the fuller Matthean version preserves the more original midrashic pattern and that the Lukan form has been abbreviated. Cf. Ellis, *Prophecy*, 159, n. 44.

65. Ellis (*Prophecy*, 251-52, n. 59) posits that Ps 118:22 may allude to the Pentateuchal text for the day (Exod 17:4-6 in which Moses was threatened with stoning) and, thus, conform more closely to the proem pattern in the rabbinica.

1. Jesus used several Jewish exegetical techniques in the Lukan version of his exposition of Isa 5:1-2: (*a*) a proem-like midrash pattern, (*b*) the *gezerah shawah* in tying the OT texts together, (*c*) the son/stone wordplay, (*d*) the exegetical term "but" (δέ) and (*e*) a *pesher*-like formula.

2. Jesus employed the OT in a typological and prophetic manner in this exposition. (*a*) He made a *pesher*-like claim to be the OT's rejected and judging stone.[66] And (*b*) he pictured himself as a type of rejected servant of God who, because of his sonship, is in a different class than the previous servants.[67]

3. The parable had a juridical function, similar to those of the OT prophets, as a word of warning and judgment to the religious leaders who rejected him. And it implicitly gives several christological teachings: (*a*) a Son of God Christology, (*b*) the rejection-exaltation theme, (*c*) the Son/stone Christology, and (*d*) a presentation of Jesus as the final messenger from God. Via the OT texts, (*e*) it also hints at Jesus' parousia, introducing a motif of eschatological judgment on the enemies of the Messiah, and thereby ties eschatology to Christology,

4. Although the general form and details of the parable are verified by the rabbinic evidence, the proem-like pattern with its catchword connections and the son/stone wordplay strengthen the arguments for the unity of the parable as a set piece of exposition from the beginning.

5. Jesus' use of the stone texts and of the son/stone wordplay here certainly provided the impetus for the Christian leaders' later use and grouping of the stone *testimonia* in Acts 4:11; Rom 9:32-33; Eph 2:20; 1 Pet 2:4-8. In consideration of the argument above, this is more likely than the contention of the classical form critics and others that the evangelists created this midrash or inserted the OT texts on the basis of later church *testimonia*.

66. See Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 70-71; and France, *Jesus and OT*, 98-99, 152-53. Otherwise: M. Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (Gütersloh: Mohr-Siebeck, 1969) 171-73.

67. Bock, *Proclamation*, 126-27. Cf. France, (*Jesus and OT*, 69-70), who sees Jesus' use of Isaiah 5 as a type of Jewish unbelief and its punishment.